Dear Harold (cc Sylvia), 8/14/01

There is nothing in your latest mailing which requires immediate response, but I wrtie now mainly to explain the enclosed letter to Belin and comment on your related notes. (By the way, I had a slide made of CE 843 plus some other fragments, with mm scale- you have my correspondence with Angel on this and the missing fragments. Will bring the slide when I come down).

Your first note, written after reading my long letter to Belin, indicates that to a degree you missed the thrust of what I wrote. I know I trusted some evidence, agreed to some of his inventions and ignored what he ignored. I merely wanted to show him, based on the evidence he asked me to consider and which he found so absolutely persuasive that there was no case at all. You are right that I do not know this aspect well and I had to do much work for that letter. But what I came up with was the type of response I had in mind, not overstepping what he asked be considered, not going beyond what he cannot but accept, esp. cases where he took the testimony. Don't worry about us all paying for his possible misuse of my letter "as the state of knowledge of and beliefs of all critics." That is the least likely thing for him to do because if what I have said is incomplete, it is still responsible and persuasive. If he wants to cast aspersions on us, then he can quote from Joesten, or even Garrison and Lane.

Also, understand that I deliberately did not approach this from the standpoint of whether Oswald was legally guilty. I played it that he cannot be proven, based on what I considered, innocent or guilty. I did add that had I been on a jury this would have made me acquit him. Thus, while from the legal standpoint it may be true that the whole case must stack up, from the academic side, there <u>is</u> something lost by npt viewing thinfs in a broader perspective. Not to Belin's degree though, obviously. I made this clear and told him that a chain is only as strong as its weakest link.

As you can see from the enclosed carbon, I accepted your idea to chide him a bit. Also, I'm glad you can accept Sylvia's theory on Belin. However, as I pointed out in my long letter to him, I'm not goigg to confront him with the wrongs of others. He is not responsible for them and is not guilty of them. Besides, what he did is bad enough and I'm having a good enough time making it hard to live with that.

He's so hysterical about this all that I can't quite predict what types of responses he'll provide. My virtual refusal to accppt his conditions presents him with a fairly good out. Either way, as I think I said before, I expect to end up with a really searing letter to him, putting forth his record of lies in the face of his wrongs and, perhaps in more or less words, ask him how he can live with himself.

Still no word from publisher, who has had book a month to this date. This may be a good sign.

Best,

Howard